

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

PPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
09/936,363	09/13/2001	Toru Iwakawa	Q65398	4514
7590 09/16/2004		EXAMINER		
Sughrue Mion Zinn			KATCHEVES, BASIL S	
Macpeak & Sea				
2100 Pennsylvania Avenue NW			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Washington, DC 20037-3202			3635	

DATE MAILED: 09/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

2

				// /			
•		Application No.	Applicant(s)	•			
•		09/936,363	IWAKAWA, TORU				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Basil Katcheves	3635				
Period fe	The MAILING DATE of this communicator Reply	tion appears on the cover sheet w	ith the correspondence address				
A SH THE - Exte after - If tho - Failt Any	IORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICAL ensions of time may be available under the provisions of 3 r SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) of period for reply is specified above, the maximum statuture to reply within the set or extended period for reply will reply received by the Office later than three months after led patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATION. 17 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a cation. ays, a reply within the statutory minimum of thiory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MO, by statute, cause the application to become A	reply be timely filed rty (30) days will be considered timely. NTHS from the mailing date of this communication BANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).	ın.			
Status							
1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed	on 22 June 2004.					
		☐ This action is non-final.					
′_	Since this application is in condition for		ters, prosecution as to the merits is	s			
		ed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.					
Disposit	ion of Claims						
5)□ 6)⊠ 7)□	Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are pending in the app 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) <u>1-18</u> is/are rejected. Claim(s) is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction	withdrawn from consideration.					
Applicat	ion Papers						
9)	The specification is objected to by the E	Examiner.					
-	The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a		by the Examiner.				
-	Applicant may not request that any objection						
11)	Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the The oath or declaration is objected to be	e correction is required if the drawing	g(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
	under 35 U.S.C. § 119	,	a cincertation of form 1 to 162.				
_	•						
a)	Acknowledgment is made of a claim for All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority do 2. Certified copies of the priority do 3. Copies of the certified copies of application from the International See the attached detailed Office action for the Internation of	cuments have been received. cuments have been received in a the priority documents have been I Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).	Application No n received in this National Stage				
Attachmer	at(s) ce of References Cited (PTO-892)	 □	O(DTO 440)				
2) Notice 3) Infor	ce of References Cited (P10-892) ce of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO mation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PT er No(s)/Mail Date	-948) Paper No	Summary (PTO-413) (s)/Mail Date Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) 				

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 1,859,105 to Munro further in view of U.S. Patent No. 2,049,555 to Zaparka.

Regarding claims 1, 13 and 14, Munro discloses an anti vibration spring comprised of twisted and bent forms of a plate (figs. 1 & 2: 10, 13). Munro also discloses the spring being secured to a structure (fig. 2) by a sound deadening material (fig. 2: 5, line 89). However, Munro does not specifically disclose the material as being rubber. Zaparka discloses a vibration dampening spring (fig. 2) secured by the use of vibration dampening rubber mounts (fig. 2: 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Mitsueda in view of Munro by using vibration dampening rubber mounts, as disclosed by Zaparka, to

Application/Control Number: 09/936,363

Art Unit: 3635

create a better sound deadening and resilient connection to the structure and to better resist weather damage.

Regarding claim 2, Munro discloses the spring as being bent outward at least twice in the vicinity of the intermediate part of the spring (fig. 2: 13).

Regarding claim 3, Munro discloses the middle, intermediate are of the spring, as being curved outward (fig. 1).

Regarding claims 4, 6 and 7, Munro does not disclose a cushion round in the center of the reinforcing base member which secures the spring to the structure. However, Zaparka discloses a cushion round at the center of the reinforcing base member (fig. 2: 6). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify Munro by adding the cushion round disclosed by Zaparka in order to help dampen vibrations transmitted through the spring.

Regarding claims 5 and 8-12, Munro does not specifically claim the use of high tension steel. However, high tension steel is commonly used in the production of heavy duty springs and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to produce a heavy duty spring using high tension steel.

Regarding claim 15, Munro discloses an absorbing member fixed to a first portion (fig. 2: 4).

Regarding claim 16, Munro discloses a cushion in the approximate center (fig. 2: 15).

Regarding claims 17 and 18, Munro discloses a curved, outward and swollen intermediate portion (fig. 2: between component 15).

Application/Control Number: 09/936,363

Art Unit: 3635

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed 6/22/04 have been fully considered. Applicant's arguments regarding the objection to the drawings is persuasive. Regarding the combination subcombination rejection included in the previous office action, the applicant has clarified that the instant application is drawn only to the reinforcing holder and not to a building. Applicant should note that the above rejection has been modified from the previous office action in response to the applicant's clarification of the claimed subject matter which does not include a building. Since the applicant has clarified that a building is not being claimed, the Mitsueda reference is not relevant to the subbcombination reinforcing holder. Applicant argues that the combination of the Munro and Zaparka references are irrelevant to the instant application because they are directed to components of a vehicle whereas the instant application's intended use is for an earthquake proof construction component. Applicant must note that the instant application is directed to a reinforcing holder and the basic claim structure, as claimed, is found in the combination references. The examination is based on the claim structure. Since the combined references meet the limitations of the instant application, as claimed, the use of the combined references may be the same as that of the intended use of the instant application. Applicant argues that the references cannot be combined with hindsight derived from the applicant's own teachings. However, both the Munro and Zaparka are analogous art. They are both intended to dampen vibrations.

Page 4

Application/Control Number: 09/936,363

Art Unit: 3635

Conclusion

Page 5

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Basil Katcheves whose telephone number is (703) 306-0232. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday from 7:30 am to 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Carl Friedman, can be reached at (703) 308-0832.

8/31/04

Carl D: Friedman Supervisory Patent Examiner Group 3600